

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-46 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1 and 11 are amended and claims 41-46 are added. The specification and claims 1 and 11 have been amended solely to correct minor informalities contained therein and do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Wallerson during the November 22 interview are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

Applicants appreciate the allowance of claims 10-12. Applicants also appreciate the indication that claims 2-8, 14-21, 24, 26-36 and 40 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. For the reasons discussed below, Applicants submit that all pending claims are allowable.

With regard to the January 20, 2004 Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review, Applicants submit that a Letter to the Official Draftsperson submitting formal Figures 1-27(d) was filed on January 2, 2001. The Notice refers to the informal drawings filed on September 29, 2000. Applicants submit that the formal drawings filed on January 2, 2001 render the objections set forth in the Notice moot. It is respectfully requested that the formal Figures 1-27(d) filed with the January 2, 2001 Letter to Official Draftsperson be accepted.

Claims 1, 9, 13, 22, 23, 25 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,512,848 to Wang et al. (Wang). The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

As discussed during the personal interview, Wang fails to disclose the combination of features recited in each of independent claims 1, 13 and 23, including, *inter alia*, laying out or executing the layout of the one or plural pieces of data according to a layout pattern that differs depending upon the determination result. As discussed during the personal interview, the object of Wang is to disclose a method for classifying blocks of image data within a document page which utilizes optical character recognition processing to address shortcomings in existing block selection techniques (col. 2, line 64 - col. 3, line 2). More particularly, Wang discloses a method for increasing the accuracy of image data classification in a page analysis system for analyzing image data of a document page (col. 3, lines 3-6). Further, as discussed during the personal interview, col. 5, lines 10-36 of Wang, which was identified on page 3 of the Office Action discloses how each block is analyzed to determine if the component within the block meets certain criteria indicative of text data or non-text data. Nowhere does Wang disclose or suggest laying out the pieces of data according to a pattern that differs depending on the determination result.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Wang fails to disclose or suggest all the features of independent claims 1, 13 and 23 as well as all the features of 9, 22, 25 and 37-39, which depend from claims 1, 13 and 23. It is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 9, 13, 22, 23, 25 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,690,492 to Nakajima. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

As discussed during the personal interview, Applicants submit that Nakajima fails to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in each of independent claims 1, 13 and 23, including, *inter alia*, laying out or executing layout of the one or plural pieces of data according to a layout pattern that differs depending upon the determination result.

As discussed during the personal interview, Nakajima discloses an image processing apparatus for outputting portions (i.e., extractions) of a multiple number of documents where the portions are identified based on certain image attributes (col. 1, lines 8-12). As discussed during the personal interview, when a document image including a figure, table and text as shown in Fig. 9 is input, and an operator selects the image and issues a text block display instruction only text is extracted from the plurality of document pages and the text blocks are displayed in the order of appearance from the first page of document images (col. 8, lines 3-17 and col. 10, lines 38-41). As discussed during the personal interview, nowhere does Nakajima disclose or suggest that even the extracted data is laid out based on a layout pattern that differs depending on whether the identified data includes only text data, only the image data or both text data and image data because in Nakajima, irrespective of the type of data which is extracted, the data is displayed in the order of appearance from the first page of the document images (col. 10, lines 38-41).

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Nakajima fails to disclose or suggest all the features of independent claims 1, 13 and 23 as well as all the features of dependent claims 9, 22, 25 and 37-39. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to new claims 41-46, Applicants submit that dependent claims 41-46 are at least allowable for the reasons discussed above with regard to independent claims 1, 13 and 23, from which they depend.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Maryam M. Ipakchi  
Registration No. 51,835

JAO:MMI/ccs

Attachment:

Amendment Transmittal

Date: November 29, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION  
Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461